

**REMARKS**

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-14, and 17-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 2, 6, 10 and 19 are the independent claims.

Claims 2, 6, 10, and 19 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

**The Withdrawal of Claim 19**

The Office Action withdrew claim 19 as allegedly being directed to an invention independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. (Office Action, page 2). This contention is manifestly incorrect and without basis in fact. Thus, the Office's withdrawal of claim 19 is in error.

Firstly, the subject matter of claim 19 was previously presented in claim 11, a claim that was previously examined. Indeed, attention is respectfully directed to the Office Action mailed November 30, 2006, which examined the claimed subject matter. Further, the contention that the invention of claim 19 is "independent" and "not connected in design, operation or effect" is manifestly incorrect. In sum, the basis for the alleged "constructive election" is incorrect and inapplicable since the subject matter of claim 19 has already been examined in the present application.

Accordingly, rejoinder and/or examination of claim 19 on the merits is/are respectfully requested.

**Traversals**

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-14, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,590,850 (Hedenberg) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,687,251 (Hoerner). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Each of independent claims 2, 6, 10, and 19 now variously recite that when projections are accommodated by accommodating grooves, an engager transmits a same level of torque from an output shaft to a lower pulley regardless of the relative positions of the projections and the accommodating grooves along an axis of the output shaft.

Applicants respectfully submit that the asserted combination does not teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features, for at least the following reasons.

In the Office Action mailed March 30, 2007, the Office acknowledged that the primary citation to Hedenberg did not teach or suggest the aforementioned features of independent claims 2, 6, and 10. (Office Action, pages 2 and 3). Nonetheless, the Office rejected independent claims 2, 6, and 10 contending that the secondary citation to Hoerner disclosed an engager and, acknowledging differences between the asserted structure of Hoerner the expressly structural features of claims 2, 6, and 10, contending that these differences were merely matters of design choice. (Office Action, page 3).

Without conceding the Office's contentions, it is submitted that Hoerner does not suggest the aforementioned features. Indeed, a review of Hoerner reveals that if the first and second torque transmitting cylinders (12 and 14) are not fully interfit, less torque is transmitted. (Hoerner, Col. 4, lines 34-44). Thus, Hoerner cannot teach or suggest the aforementioned features of amended independent claims 2, 6, 10, and 19. And, as a result, the asserted combination is deficient.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 2, 6, and 10 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Serial No.: 10/803,913

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-13-07

By:   
Michael E. Kondoudis  
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500